REMARKS

In an Office Action mailed on September 7, 2004, claims 9, 11, 13, 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lamson; and claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamson. These rejections are addressed below.

Rejections of Claims 9, 12 and 13:

As amended, the electrical device of independent claim 9 includes multiple process layers. The electrical device also includes an interconnection circuit that is formed in one of the process layers located between another one of the process layers in which a power bus is formed and electrical contact pads to receive a supply voltage.

Contrary to the limitations of amended independent claim 9, Lamson teaches metal bumps that are formed in the same process layer as the alleged power bus. More specifically, the Examiner refers to Fig. 6 of Lamson, a figure that shows power supply buses 41 and 42. As depicted in Fig. 6, each of the power supply buses 41 and 42 includes metal bumps. *See, for example*, the corresponding text in lines 4-24 in column 5 of Lamson. Thus, the Examiner is reading Lamson so that the bumps are the alleged electrical contact pads of claim 9, and the power bus is either the power bus 41 or 42 of Lamson. However, with this interpretation of Fig. 6, Lamson fails to teach the amended claim limitations, i.e., the limitations from original dependent claim 11.

More specifically, in rejecting claim 11 in view of Lamson, the Examiner refers to Fig. 3 of Lamson, a figure that shows multiple process layers. However, the Examiner is selectively reading Lamson to combine the process layers shown in Fig. 3 with the depiction of the power buses 41 and 42 in Fig. 6. Although the device in Fig. 6 may very well have multiple process layers, there is no teaching or suggestion in Lamson regarding forming redundant connections between the metal bumps of Fig. 6 41 and 42 and the power buses 41 and 42 using connections in different process layers. Thus, Lamson fails to teach the limitations of amended independent claim 9. Therefore, withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of amended independent claim 1 in view of Lamson is requested.

Claims 12 and 13 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 20 and 22:

The method of independent claim 20 recites electrically connecting external contacts of a semiconductor device to internal buses of the semiconductor device and establishing redundant connections between the buses and the external contacts.

Contrary to the limitations of independent claim 1, the Examiner refers to Fig. 6 of Lamson, a figure that shows metal bumps and power supply buses connected in the same process layer. Thus, regardless of whether these entities are deemed to be external or internal, they are all either the same external or internal. In other words, Fig. 6 of Lamson does not teach forming *external* contacts of a semiconductor device to *internal* buses where redundant connections are established between the buses and the external contacts (*emphasis added*). Although Lamson generally refers to process layers, no redundant connection between internal buses and external contact layers are disclosed or even suggested in Lamson.

Thus, for at least the reasons that are set forth above, withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claim 20 is requested. Claim 22 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from a patentable claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections and a favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance are requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0655D1US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 17, 2004

Fred G. Pruner, Jr., Reg. No. 40,779
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 KATY FREEWAY, SUITE 100
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]